

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMUNICATION and RESPONSE TO STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE	Title: DIAGNOSTIC SYSTEM FOR A MODULAR FIELDBUS BOARD	
	Inventor(s):	Gunther Rogoll et al.
	Application No.:	10/574,555
	Filing Date:	May 18, 2006
	Confirmation No.	2113
Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450	Examiner:	Teixeira Moffat
	Art Unit:	2863
	Notice of Allowance:	December 3, 2009

Dear Sir:

COMMUNICATION

Typographical Errors On Notice Of Allowance

Applicants would point out that the title on the Notice of Allowance has a typographical error, *i.e.*, the word "BOAD" should be "BOARD", as can be seen on the application and Declaration as originally filed.

Further, Applicants note that the inventor Gunther Rogoll's first name is incorrectly typed on the Notice of Allowance as "Gunter". The correct name is "Gunther", as evidenced on the Declaration as originally filed. ✓

Applicants request that these typographical errors be corrected in the issued patent

Response to Telephone Interview

Applicants authorized the Examiner in a telephone discussion on November 30, 2009 to amend the application in an Examiner's Amendment. Applicants acknowledge and appreciate the amendments having been made.

RESPONSE TO REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication as to the allowance of the present application.

However, applicants respectfully submit the Statements of Reasons for Allowance are, in and of themselves, inappropriate. It is noted that the reasons for allowance may be set forth in instances in which " . . . the Examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims." (37 CFR §1.104(e)(2004)). In the present case, applicants believe the record as a whole does make the reasons for allowance clear and, therefore, no statement by the Examiner is necessary or warranted. Furthermore, the applicants do not necessarily agree with each statement in the reasons for allowance.

Specifically, it has been indicated that the claims are allowed by importing interpretations into the claims in relation to the prior art that results in a potential imprecise and/or inaccurate understanding of the reasons. This places an unwarranted interpretation upon the claims. Such a characterization of the claims does not properly take into account applicants' claimed invention as reflected in the specification and the applicants' responses to the Examiner's office actions.

Therefore, while applicants believe the claims are allowable, applicants do not acquiesce that patentability resides in only the features, exactly as expressed in the claims, nor that each feature is required for patentability.

Respectfully submitted,

Fay Sharpe LLP



Mark S. Svat, Reg. No. 34,261
The Halle Building – Fifth Floor
1228 Euclid Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44115
216-363-9000

2-26-10


Date

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any item referred to herein as being attached or enclosed) is (are) being transmitted to the USPTO by electronic transmission via the EFS Web on the date indicated below.

2-26-10

Date



Name: Karen M. Forsyth